

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant adds claim 17, which is supported throughout the specification.

I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-5, 7-13, 15, and 16 presently stand rejected. Claims 6 and 14 are allowed.

II. Prior Art Rejections and Statement of Substance of Interview

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,568,784 B2 to Izumi et al. (hereinafter “Izumi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,561,615 B2 to Okawa et al. (hereinafter “Okawa”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claim 1 *inter alia* recites: “a drive member that is connected to said moving member at a connecting section and that is for driving said moving member along the main-scanning direction.” Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the drive member, as set forth in claim 1 and as discussed during the interview.

In particular, Applicant thanks the Examiner for a courteous telephonic interview on November 29, 2007. An Examiner’s Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was mailed on December 7, 2007. The PTO-413 requires the Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview, Applicant respectfully noted that both Izumi and Okawa do not disclose a driving member as set forth in claim 1 because the belt 30 of Okawa is for moving the headholding body 31 along separating direction and not the carriage along the main scanning

direction (col. 8, lines 22 to 37). That is, the belt 30 of Okawa is used for driving the head holding body 31 in separating direction as described in Fig. 4 and col. 8, lines 21 to 36. Applicant further noted that interpreting the not shown belt to be the shown belt 30 is inconsistent with col. 7, lines 51 to 63 of Okawa and col. 6, lines 23 to 36. Specifically, the pulleys of the drive means 36 are disposed at both ends in main scanning direction of the drive means, which is inconsistent with Fig. 2A that shows driving rod 126 (alleged pulley) at both ends in the sub scanning direction and not the scanning direction.

The Examiner indicated that he will further carefully consider the prior art references and indicated that Applicant's Representatives will be contacted if the Examiner feels that the rejection can be maintained.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 13.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in view of Okawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,439,684 B1 to Yoshimura et al. (hereinafter "Yoshimura"), claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in

view of Okawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,988,784 to Takemura et al. (hereinafter “Takemura”), and claims 10-12, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Izumi in view of Okawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,905,186 B2 to Kojima (hereinafter “Kojima”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Claims 4, 7, 10-12, 15, and 16 depend on claim 1. Applicant has already demonstrated that the combined teachings of Izumi and Okawa do not meet all the requirements of independent claim 1. Yoshimura, Takemura, and Kojima do not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Izumi and Okawa. Together, the combined teachings of these references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 1. Since claims 4, 7, 10-12, 15, and 16 depend on claim 1, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6 and 14 are allowed.

IV. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claim 17, which is patentable by virtue of its dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 AND
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
Attorney Docket No.: Q77942
Application No.: 10/686,772

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 4, 2008